

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for review of the present application as evidenced by the Office Action dated June 19, 2007. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the objections contained therein.

Claims 1, 3, 15 and 17 have been amended by this Response. Claims 2 and 16 have been canceled herewith. Claims 1, 2-15 and 17-19 remain in the application. No new matter has been entered by this Response.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 4 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,047,018 to Emi in view of U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2006/0239334 to Kwon, et al. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Applicants have amended claim 1 to include the subject matter of claim 2, which the Examiner indicated would be allowable if so written. Claim 1 is therefore allowable. Claims 4 and 6 depend directly or indirectly from allowable claim 1 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons claim 1 is allowable.

The Examiner rejected claims 5, 15 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Emi in view of Kwon, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,865,216 to Beamish et al. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

- Claim 5 depends from allowable claim 1 and is therefore allowable for at least the same reasons claim 1 is allowable.

- Claim 15 has been amended to include the subject matter of claim 16, which the Examiner indicated would be allowable if so written. Claim 15 is therefore allowable.

- Claim 18 depends directly or indirectly from allowable claim 15 and is therefore allowable for at least the same reasons claim 15 is allowable.

The Examiner rejected claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Emi in view of Kwon and Beamish, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,434,184 to Lindsey. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Claim 7 depends from allowable claim 1 and is therefore allowable for at least the same reasons claim 1 is allowable.

The Examiner rejected claims 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Emi in view of Kwon, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,084,901 to

Nagazumi. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Claim 8 depends from allowable claim 1 and is therefore allowable for at least the same reasons claim 1 is allowable.


The Examiner rejected claims 14 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over EMI in view of Kwon and Beamish, and further in view of Nagazumi. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

- In paragraph 20 of the June 19, 2007 Office Action, the Examiner stated claim 14 is allowed.

- Claim 19 depends from allowable claim 15 and is therefore allowable for at least the same reasons claim 15 is allowable.

Accordingly, with entry of this amendment and consideration of the arguments and remarks contained herein, all pending claims are now allowable, and a notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney if further issues remain in the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,

  
Nathan O. Jensen  
Reg. No. 41,460  
Attorney for Applicant

Rockwell Collins Inc.  
Intellectual Property Department  
400 Collins Road NE M/S 124-323  
Cedar Rapids, IA 52498  
Telephone: (319) 295-1184  
Facsimile No. (319) 295-8777  
Customer No.: 26383